

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
STATESBORO DIVISION**

JAMES H. HAWES,

Plaintiff,

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 6:16-cv-15

v.

STATE OF GEORGIA,

Defendant.

ORDER and MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Presently before the Court are Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Complaint, (doc. 16), and Plaintiff's Response in Opposition, (doc. 21). For the reasons which follow, I **RECOMMEND** that the Court **GRANT** Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, **DISMISS** Plaintiff's Complaint, and **DIRECT** the Clerk of Court to **CLOSE** this case. I further **RECOMMEND** that the Court **DENY** Plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.

BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed this cause of action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on February 4, 2016. (Doc. 1.) Because he paid the full filing fee, this Court did not conduct a frivolity review. In his Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that his sentence was inappropriately enhanced and seeks damages for the "5 and a half years of incarceration." (*Id.* at p. 7.) Plaintiff, out on parole, names the State of Georgia as the sole Defendant in this case.

Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss on June 2, 2016, asserting that this Court should dismiss Plaintiff's case because: 1) service was defective; 2) Eleventh Amendment immunity bars the suit; and 3) Section 1983 bars the suit. (Doc. 16.) Plaintiff filed a Response, but instead

of responding to Defendant's arguments, Plaintiff essentially asks this Court to stay his case pending the outcome of his criminal appeal in the Georgia Court of Appeals. (Doc. 21, pp. 1–2.)

STANDARD OF REVIEW

When ruling on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss, the Court must “accept[] the allegations in the complaint as true and constru[e] them in the light most favorable to the plaintiff.” Belanger v. Salvation Army, 556 F.3d 1153, 1155 (11th Cir. 2009). “A complaint must state a facially plausible claim for relief, and ‘[a] claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.’” Wooten v. Quicken Loans, Inc., 626 F.3d 1187, 1196 (11th Cir. 2010) (quoting Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)). “A pleading that offers labels and conclusions or a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action” does not suffice. Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678.

“The plausibility standard is not akin to a probability requirement, but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully. Where a complaint pleads facts that are merely consistent with a defendant’s liability, it stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of entitlement to relief.” Id. (internal punctuation and citation omitted). While a court must accept all factual allegations in a complaint as true, this tenet “is inapplicable to legal conclusions. Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements,” are insufficient. Id.

DISCUSSION

I. Eleventh Amendment and Sovereign Immunity

The Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution and traditional principles of state sovereignty bars Plaintiff’s action against the State of Georgia. Alden v. Maine, 527 U.S.

706, 712–13 (1999). The United States Supreme Court has construed the Eleventh Amendment as a jurisdictional bar extending to federal suits against a non-consenting state “by her own citizens as well as citizens of another state.” Port Auth. Trans-Hudson v. Feeney, 495 U.S. 299, 304 (1990). Section 1983 does not abrogate these well-established immunities of a state from suit without its consent. Will v. Mich. Dep’t of State Police, 491 U.S. 58, 67 (1989). The State of Georgia has not consented or waived its immunity in this case. Therefore, Plaintiff’s claims against the State of Georgia are barred, and the Court should **DISMISS** this case.

II. Heck v. Humphrey and the Rooker-Feldman Doctrine

In the alternative, this Court is also precluded from reviewing Plaintiff’s claims by the Supreme Court’s decision in Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994). Plaintiff indicates in his Response to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss that he “has filed an appeal concerning his criminal sentence in the Georgia Court of Appeals.” (Doc. 21, p. 2.)

In Heck, a state prisoner filed a Section 1983 damages action against the prosecutors and investigator in his criminal case for their actions which resulted in his conviction. The Supreme Court analogized the plaintiff’s claim to a common-law cause of action for malicious prosecution, which requires as an element of the claim that the prior criminal proceeding be terminated in favor of the accused. 512 U.S. at 484. The Supreme Court reasoned:

We think the hoary principle that civil tort actions are not appropriate vehicles for challenging the validity of outstanding criminal judgments applies to § 1983 damages actions that necessarily require the plaintiff to prove the unlawfulness of his conviction or confinement, just as it has always applied to actions for malicious prosecution (footnote omitted).

We hold that, in order to recover damages for allegedly unconstitutional conviction or imprisonment, or for other harm caused by actions whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence invalid, (footnote omitted), a § 1983 plaintiff must prove that the conviction or sentence has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, declared invalid by a state tribunal authorized to make such determination, or called into question by a federal court’s

issuance of a writ of habeas corpus, 28 U.S.C. § 2254. A claim for damages bearing that relationship to a conviction or sentence that has not been so invalidated is not cognizable under § 1983. Thus, when a state prisoner seeks damages in a § 1983 suit, the district court must consider whether a judgment in favor of the plaintiff would necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence; if it would, the complaint must be dismissed unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated.

Id. at 486–87 (emphasis added).

Under Heck, a plaintiff who is attempting “to recover damages for allegedly unconstitutional conviction or imprisonment, or for other harm caused by actions whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence invalid,” must make a showing that his conviction, sentence, or other criminal judgment was reversed, expunged, declared invalid by an appropriate state tribunal, or called into question in a federal court’s issuance of a writ of habeas corpus. Id. If a plaintiff fails to make this showing, then he cannot bring an action under Section 1983. Id. at 489. Furthermore, to the extent a plaintiff contends that a favorable ruling on his claims would not invalidate his conviction, sentence, confinement, or other criminal judgment, the burden is on the plaintiff to prove this contention in order for his claims to proceed. Id. at 487. Although Heck involved a claim brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for money damages, Heck’s holding has been extended to claims seeking declaratory or injunctive relief, as well as money damages. See Wilkinson v. Dotson, 544 U.S. 74, 81–82 (2005); Abella v. Rubino, 63 F.3d 1063, 1066 (11th Cir. 1995); see also Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973) (“[W]e hold today that when a state prisoner is challenging the very fact or duration of his physical imprisonment, and the relief he seeks is a determination that he is entitled to immediate release or a speedier release from that imprisonment, his sole federal remedy is a writ of habeas corpus.”); Desravines v. Fla. Dep’t of Fin. Servs., No. 6:11-CV-235-ORL-22, 2011 WL 2292180, at *3 (M.D. Fla. May 23, 2011), *report and recommendation adopted* by No. 6:11-CV-

235-ORL-22, 2011 WL 2222170 (M.D. Fla. June 8, 2011) (citing Gray v. Kinsey, No. 3:09-cv-324/LC/MD, 2009 WL 2634205, at *9 (N.D. Fla. Aug. 25, 2009) (“Under this standard, it is not unusual for a § 1983 claim to be dismissed for failure to satisfy Heck’s favorable termination requirement.”); Domotor v. Wennet, 630 F. Supp. 2d 1368, 1379 (S.D. Fla. 2009) (“allowing the plaintiff to circumvent applicable state procedures and collaterally attack her convictions in federal court is the precise situation that Heck seeks to preclude” when plaintiff entered into a plea agreement with knowledge of substantially all of the allegations that now form the basis of a § 1983 action for damages); Cooper v. Georgia, No. CV413-091, 2013 WL 2253214, at *2 (S.D. Ga. May 22, 2013), *report and recommendation adopted* by No. CV413-091, 2013 WL 2660046 (S.D. Ga. June 11, 2013); Brown v. Renfroe, No. CV210-003, 2011 WL 902197, at *2 (S.D. Ga. Jan. 25, 2011), *report and recommendation adopted* by No. CV210-003, 2011 WL 892359 (S.D. Ga. Mar. 9, 2011), *aff’d sub nom.*, Brown v. Coleman, 439 F. App’x 794 (11th Cir. 2011).

In this case, Plaintiff has not shown favorable termination of his conviction or sentence. In fact, Plaintiff specifically states that he has just filed an appeal concerning his criminal sentence and asks this Court to “allow him to file his complaint again once the ruling of the Georgia Court of Appeals has been rendered.” (Doc. 21, p. 1.) Accordingly, the Heck decision unquestionably precludes Plaintiff’s claims.

Further additional grounds also support dismissal. Pursuant to the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, the Court is without jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims, which essentially seek review of a state-court criminal charge against him. “The Rooker-Feldman doctrine derives from Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Company, 263 U.S. 413 (1923), and District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983), and provides that, as a general matter, federal district courts lack jurisdiction to review a final state court decision.” McCorvey v. Weaver, No. 15-

10470, 2015 WL 5751756, at *1 (11th Cir. Oct. 2, 2015). “Rooker-Feldman applies because, among the federal courts, Congress authorized only the Supreme Court to reverse or modify a state court decision.” Helton v. Ramsay, 566 F. App’x 876, 877 (11th Cir. 2014) (citing Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005)). Because Plaintiff, through this Section 1983 action, essentially asks this Court to award damages for a sentencing conviction obtained in the State of Georgia courts, this Court lacks jurisdiction over his claims.

As indicated above, both Heck v. Humphrey and the Rooker-Feldman doctrine provide separate, independent bases for the Court to dismiss this action.

III. Younger Abstention Doctrine

Additionally, insofar as Plaintiff is asking this Court to intervene in the state case’s ongoing proceedings, the Younger abstention doctrine also bars Plaintiff’s Complaint. Under the Younger abstention doctrine, a federal court must abstain from exercising jurisdiction over a case where there is an ongoing state action. See Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971). While Younger involved a federal suit for injunctive relief of the ongoing state proceedings, the Eleventh Circuit has also indicated that the Younger abstention extends to cases involving Section 1983 claims for monetary damages. See Doby v. Strength, 758 F.2d 1405, 1405–06 (11th Cir. 1985) (requiring Younger abstention where plaintiff raised Fourth Amendment Section 1983 damages claims related to ongoing state criminal proceedings); see also Kowalski v. Tesmer, 543 U.S. 125, 133 (2004) (intervention in ongoing state court proceedings is not appropriate as a Section 1983 cause of action when there is ample opportunity to raise constitutional challenges in those state court proceedings).

Here, because Plaintiff has indicated that he is still appealing his conviction in the Georgia Court of Appeals, any ruling by this Court as to the validity of Plaintiff’s sentence and

whether he should be awarded damages to that effect could substantially interfere with the results reached in the state court proceeding. See 31 Foster Children v. Bush, 329 F.3d 1255, 1276 (11th Cir. 2003) (noting the importance of “whether the federal proceeding will interfere with an ongoing state court proceeding” in determining whether Younger abstention is appropriate). Moreover, Plaintiff cannot demonstrate the lack of adequate remedy at law—particularly as he is currently pursuing his claims in the Georgia Court of Appeals. See Boyd v. Georgia, No. CV 112-042, 2012 WL 2862157, at *2 (S.D. Ga. May 14, 2012), *report and recommendation adopted by* No. CV 112-042, 2012 WL 2862123 (S.D. Ga. July 11, 2012), *aff’d*, 512 F. App’x 915 (11th Cir. 2013) (concluding that plaintiff had an adequate remedy at law with respect to constitutional claims that he could bring in his pending state criminal case). The Younger abstention doctrine provides yet another independent, alternative basis for the Court to dismiss this action.

IV. Leave to Appeal *In Forma Pauperis*

The Court should also deny Plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.¹ Though Plaintiff has, of course, not yet filed a notice of appeal, it would be appropriate to address these issues in the Court’s order of dismissal. Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3) (trial court may certify that appeal is not taken in good faith “before or after the notice of appeal is filed”).

An appeal cannot be taken *in forma pauperis* if the trial court certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3). Good faith in this context must be judged by an objective standard. Busch v. Cty. of Volusia, 189 F.R.D. 687, 691 (M.D. Fla. 1999). A party does not proceed in good faith when he seeks to advance a frivolous claim or argument. See Coppededge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). A claim or argument is frivolous when it appears the factual allegations are clearly baseless or the legal

¹ A certificate of appealability is not required in this Section 1983 action.

theories are indisputably meritless. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989); Carroll v. Gross, 984 F.2d 392, 393 (11th Cir. 1993). Or, stated another way, an *in forma pauperis* action is frivolous and, thus, not brought in good faith, if it is “without arguable merit either in law or fact.” Napier v. Preslicka, 314 F.3d 528, 531 (11th Cir. 2002); see also Brown v. United States, Nos. 407CV085, 403CR001, 2009 WL 307872, at *1–2 (S.D. Ga. Feb. 9, 2009).

Based on the above analysis of Plaintiff’s action, there are no non-frivolous issues to raise on appeal, and an appeal would not be taken in good faith. Thus, the Court should **DENY** Plaintiff *in forma pauperis* status on appeal.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, I **RECOMMEND** that the Court **GRANT** Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss, **DISMISS** Plaintiff’s Complaint, **DIRECT** the Clerk of Court to **CLOSE** this case, and **DENY** Plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.

The Court **ORDERS** any party seeking to object to this Report and Recommendation to file specific written objections within fourteen (14) days of the date on which this Report and Recommendation is entered. Any objections asserting that the Magistrate Judge failed to address any contention raised in the Complaint must also be included. Failure to do so will bar any later challenge or review of the factual findings or legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). A copy of the objections must be served upon all other parties to the action. The filing of objections is not a proper vehicle through which to make new allegations or present additional evidence.

Upon receipt of Objections meeting the specificity requirement set out above, a United States District Judge will make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report, proposed findings, or recommendation to which objection is made and may accept, reject, or modify in

whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. Objections not meeting the specificity requirement set out above will not be considered by a District Judge. A party may not appeal a Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation directly to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. Appeals may be made only from a final judgment entered by or at the direction of a District Judge. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to serve a copy of this Report and Recommendation upon the parties.

SO ORDERED and REPORTED and RECOMMENDED, this 21st day of November, 2016.



R. STAN BAKER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA